

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
DIVISION

RECEIVED

OCT 08 2021

RICHARD W. NAGEL, CLERK OF COURT  
COLUMBUS, OHIO

Stephanie marshall

(Enter Above the Name of the Plaintiff in this Action)

vs.

Christopher L Marshall

(Enter above the name of the Defendant in this Action)

If there are additional Defendants, please list them:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2 2 1 C V 4 9 9 2

Judge Morrison

MAGISTRATE JUDGE JOLSON

COMPLAINT

I. Parties to the action:

Plaintiff: Place your name and address on the lines below. The address you give must be the address where the court may contact you and mail documents to you. A telephone number is required.

Stephanie marshall

Name - Full Name Please - PRINT

P.O. Box 23091

Street Address

Columbus, OH 43223

City, State and Zip Code

614-530-9223

Telephone Number

If there are additional Plaintiffs in this suit, a separate piece of paper should be attached immediately behind this page with their full names, addresses and telephone numbers. If there are no other Plaintiffs, continue with this form.

Defendant(s):

Place the name and address of each Defendant you listed in the caption on the first page of this Complaint. This form is invalid unless each Defendant appears with full address for proper service.

1. Christopher L. Marshall  
Name - Full Name/Please  
310 Leander, TX Northern Trl, Leander, TX 7864  
Address: Street, City, State and Zip Code
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_

If there are additional Defendants, please list their names and addresses on a separate sheet of paper.

## II. Subject Matter Jurisdiction

Check the box or boxes that describes your lawsuit:

- ☐ Title 28 U.S.C. § 1343(3)  
[A civil rights lawsuit alleging that Defendant(s) acting under color of State law, deprived you of a right secured by federal law or the Constitution.]
- ☐ Title 28 U.S.C. § 1331  
[A lawsuit "arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States."]
- ☐ Title 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1)  
[A lawsuit between citizens of different states where the matter in controversy exceeds \$75,000.]
- ☒ Title \_\_\_\_\_ United States Code, Section \_\_\_\_\_  
[Other federal status giving the court subject matter jurisdiction.]

(Not sure of Title: Involves Family Support Act of 1988)



STATEMENT OF FACTS

Original case number: 07dr062236

1. There was never a problem with garnishing my wages for child support until I appealed Judge Priesse's decision in January of 2018, case 18-AP-22.
2. The second time that I brought the issue to court; Magistrate Webber shifted the blame to me instead of referring to the federal guidelines that have been in effect and should have been utilized for over three decades.
3. Judge Priesse referenced just as much from the federal guidelines as Magistrate Webber when adopting the judgment on 09/16/2019.
4. When discussing this case with Magistrate Novack (she wanted to know how to have the clerks' file the motion) she sounded like she had just as much knowledge in regards to the Family Support Act of 1988, as Magistrate Webber and Judge Priesse.
5. I have had to not only contact FCCSEA, but also have had to file motions with the courts in order to get the FCCSEA to garnish my wages per court order. The last time being on 04/15/2020.
6. By Judge Priesse's own volition stated that the Plaintiff was not made aware of the proceedings. I have the copies proving that the courts told and showed me that they had sent copies to the Plaintiff. This would be infringement upon the rights of the plaintiff in this case to not make all parties aware of the proceedings.

7. Judge Priesses' misrepresentation of facts, the judge stated that the FCCSEA did not know where I worked until I went to them. However, the FCCSEA Case Worker is the one who acknowledged that they still had my social security number. (That is mentioned in the Family Support Act of 1988 to fulfill my responsibilities to have child support garnished) Then she used my social security number to put into the CSEA system herself and showed me, my employers' information. Proving that they could and already knew where I worked. This proved to me that the FCCSEA was willfully not complying with federal regulations and the court order to garnish my wages.
8. Judge Priesse and the Magistrates failed to state any laws pertaining to their judgement/s. (Local rules are not laws)

Again I have kept gainful employment and the FCCSEA has my social security number in which to obtain my employer information to be able to garnish my wages.

Last time I brought the issue to court, the lawyer representing the FCCSEA acknowledged that the FCCSEA was in contempt of the court order to garnish my wages. There was no one from the FCCSEA to explain what may have happened to not garnish my wages.

Just an additional note, I am the only one complaining about my wages not being garnished. Only me, not the plaintiff, CSEA, or the courts.

Companies I was working for.

Dawson- 4/1/2018 to 8/1/2018

LBrands-3/1/2019 to 5/1/2019

Mid-Ohio- 12/01/2019 to 2/1/2020

Surge- 02/2021-06/2021

### RELIEF

I am seeking to have the lower court/s, the FCCSEA and judges found in contempt of the court order and the Family Support Act of 1988 passed by congress.

I am also looking to find the judge and lower court system bias and to have had a conflict of interest in their inability to uphold the law for the Defendant as much as it appears for the Plaintiff.

Then I propose, as a remedy, to have the child support in arrears waved to the time that the FCCSEA willfully refused to garnish my wages. If there may be a better way to remedy this case, because of all the unlawful procedures and judgments, then I request that as well.

Christopher L. Marshall, 310 Northern Trl, Leander, TX 78641



